

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 17 amended and claims 2, 10, and 18 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083 and Cavill, U.S. Patent No. 6,003,069. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree and have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to further emphasize the distinction between Applicants' claims and Savitzky. The claims have been amended only to incorporate respective dependent claims and add no new matter or new issues.

The Examiner has improperly used multiple components of Savitzky to correspond to the original receipt of Applicants' claims as it is acted upon in the various elements of Applicants' claims.

The Examiner first suggests that Applicants' original receipt corresponds to a transaction of Savitzky (p. 2). The Examiner next suggests that Applicants' original receipt corresponds to a document of Savitzky (p. 3). The Examiner then suggests that Applicants' original receipt corresponds to a hotlist database of Savitzky (p. 9).

Similarly, the Examiner first suggests that Applicants' print job agent corresponds to client A of Savitzky (p. 2). The Examiner then suggests that Applicants' print job agent corresponds to a hotlist agent of Savitzky (p. 9).

Each of Applicants' claims, as a whole, must be disclosed by the prior art. Elements of Applicant's claims may not be reassigned to various prior art components on an element-by-element basis. Components assigned to elements of Applicants' claims must remain consistent throughout a claim. For example, when comparing Applicants' independent claim 1 to Savitzky, the Examiner cannot analyze a transaction as an original receipt for (a), a hotlist database as an original receipt for (c), and a document as an original receipt for (f).

No selection of components from Savitzky and Cavill discloses all of the

limitations of any of Applicants' claims. In particular, there is no correspondence between the original receipt and any component disclosed in Savitzky.

Analyzing a transaction of Savitzky as the original receipt of Applicants' claims, we find that it Savitzky does not disclose any of the transactions being updated. Each transaction is generated and then handled. Only the hotlist database is updated to reflect movement of the document.

Analyzing the document of Savitzky as the original receipt of Applicant's claims we find that Savitzky does not disclose the document being updated to indicate that at least a portion of it was printed, or even that a portion of it was passed on to some other device or client. Only the hotlist database is updated to reflect movement of the document.

Analyzing the hotlist database of Savitzky as the original receipt of Applicant's amended independent claims we find that it fails at 1(g), 9(h), and 17(e). The Examiner has suggested that Agency (32) of Savitzky responds to the server of Applicants' claims. Savitzky does specifically disclose or suggest that the hotlist database is created on a server, or Agency (32).

Furthermore, Savitzky does not disclose the hotlist database being copied to a print job agent, no matter whether the Client A or the hotlist agent of Savitzky is considered to be the print job agent of Applicants' claims. Therefore, Savitzky does not disclose copying the original receipt to the print job agent.

No single component disclosed in either Savitzky or Cavill responds to all of the limitations of the original receipt of Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Specifically, those limitations are: creating on the server an original receipt for the document, updating the original receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was provided to the print job agent, and copying the original receipt to the print job agent. Since the Examiner cannot point to a single component of either Savitzky or Cavill that responds to the original receipt in all of the elements of Applicants' independent claims, Applicants' independent claims are not made obvious by Savitzky and Cavill.

As to claims 5 and 13, the Examiner appears to suggest that the language, "Printer agency 60 might handle additional configuration tasks such as having the

user select a printer by presenting the user with a Web page showing printer locations and includes a clickable map of the printers," of Savitzky responds to Applicants' claim language, "wherein uniquely identifying the output device to the server includes conveying a serial number of the output device to the server" in Applicants' claim 5 and similar language in Applicants' claim 13. Printer locations displayed on a clickable map are not the equivalent of a serial number. Nothing in this cited language or anywhere else in Savitzky or Cavill suggests or discloses conveying a serial number to a server.

As to Applicants' claims 7, 8, 15, and 16, while Savitzky does disclose encryption, Savitzky does not disclose the server doing so with a device specific public key for the output device or a symmetric key. Nowhere is Savitzky is any sort of public key or symmetric key encryption described or disclosed.

In view of Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(3), a marked-up version of the claims amended by this response is attached hereto.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application as amended defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson
James E. Clough

By Mark G. Pannell
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 02/03/03
(719) 260-7900

MARKED UP VERSION OF AMENDED CLAIMS

1. (amended) A method for printing a document accessible by a server, the method comprising:

- (a) creating on the server an original receipt for the document;
- (b) providing at least one portion of the document from the server to a print job agent;
- (c) updating the original receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was provided to the print job agent;
- (d) communicating the at least one portion of the document from the print job agent to an output device; [and,]
- (e) printing the at least one portion of the document using the output device;
- (f) copying the original receipt to the print job agent; and,
- (g) updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was printed.

9. (amended) A system for printing a document accessible by a server, the method comprising:

- (a) a server having access to a document;
- (b) means for creating an original receipt for the document on the server;
- (c) a print job agent;
- (d) means for providing at least one portion of the document from the server to the print job agent;
- (e) means for updating the original receipt to indicate each portion of the document provided to the print job agent;
- (e) an output device for printing the at least one portion of the document; [and,]
- (g) means for communicating the at least one portion of the document from the print job agent to the output device;
- (h) means for copying the original receipt to the print job agent;
and,

(i) means for updating the copy of the receipt to indicate each portion of the document printed.

17. (amended) A program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for printing a document accessible by a server, the method steps comprising:

- (a) creating on the server an original receipt for the document;
- (b) providing at least one portion of the document from the server to a print job agent;
- (c) updating the original receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was provided to the print job agent;
- (d) communicating the at least one portion of the document to an output device for printing the at least one portion of the document;
- (e) copying the original receipt to the print job agent; and,
- (f) updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one portion of the document was printed.